

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested

Claims 1-13 and 45-72 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 11, 49, and 61 are independent.

New claims 45 to 72 have been added to define further aspects of the Applicants' invention and are fully supported in the specification.

In the Official Action, claims 2-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reasons noted at pages 2-3 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the ground that the person of ordinary skill in the art would not be confused as to the meaning or scope of the claims. Nevertheless, claim 2 has been amended for clarity with respect to the specification and Drawings, and not in response to any statutory requirement

With respect to prior art, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,651,217 to Kennedy et al. ("Kennedy"). Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy. Applicants thank the Examiner for identifying claim 9 as being allowable over the prior art. Applicants, however, respectfully submit the objections in view of the Kennedy reference are not appropriate for the reasons set forth below.

According to one aspect of the Applicants' invention as defined by independent claim 1, Applicants provide, during an Internet session where a user is viewing a web page that includes a prompt for an email address, a method of creating and forwarding an email forwarding address to the user. The method comprises creating and storing a unique email forwarding address for the user that is automatically associated with the web page. The unique email forwarding address is dedicated for use by an entity associated with the web page to enable the entity to send email messages to the user. Email messages directed to the unique email

forwarding address are re-directed to a target email associated with the user. The unique email forwarding address is sent to the user to enable the user to use the unique email forwarding address to satisfy the email address prompt.

Kennedy discloses a system and method for populating forms with previously used data values. During the method, an “autofill” profile is used to obtain an initial set of values to be used to populate subsequent forms. When a user first displays a form including common field labels such as an email address, a profile generator function extracts values entered by the user, uses the extracted values to populate the autofill profile and prompts the user to fill in missing values of the autofill profile. After the autofill profile has been completed, the autofill profile is saved and used as the basis for populating future forms. Consequently, when the user visits a site that requests an email address, the email address value stored in the autofill profile is used to satisfy the email address request.

Applicants submit, however, that Kennedy in no way teaches or suggests *creating a unique email forwarding address for the user* that is automatically associated with the web page, with the email forwarding address being *dedicated for use by an entity associated with the web page* to enable the entity to send email messages to the user, and with email directed to the email forwarding address being *re-directed to a target email address associated with the user*. Kennedy teaches to store a user’s target email address in a profile field and use that stored target email address when an email address web prompt is received. No unique email forwarding address is created by Kennedy in response to a web page email address prompt which results in email being re-directed. Rather, a saved email address is simply re-used whenever an email address prompt is received. To suggest otherwise, clearly disregards the teachings of Kennedy. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 distinguishes patentably over Kennedy and should be allowed. As claims 2-10, 45, and 46 are dependent either directly or indirectly on independent claim 1, which is deemed allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims should also be allowed.

Independent claim 11 is directed to a system for creating and forwarding unique email forwarding addresses and is similar in scope to independent claim 1. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully submit that this claim distinguishes patentably over Kennedy for the same reasons set forth above and should be allowed. As claims 12 and 13 are dependent either directly or indirectly on independent claim 11, which is deemed allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims should also be allowed.

New independent claim 49 incorporates the subject matter of claims 1, 8 and allowable claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this claim distinguishes patentably over the Kennedy reference and should be allowed. As claims 50-58 are dependent either directly or indirectly on independent claim 49, which is deemed allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims should also be allowed.

New independent claim 61 also defines a method of creating and forwarding a unique email forwarding address for a user and is believed to distinguish patentably over the Kennedy reference for the same reasons set forth above. As claims 62 to 72 are dependent either directly or indirectly on independent claim 61, which is deemed allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims should also be allowed.

In view of the above, it is believed the application is in order for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 625-3507. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard J. Bauer
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 31,588

PATENT ADMINISTRATOR
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
525 West Monroe Street
Suite 1600
Chicago, Illinois 60661-3693
Facsimile: (312) 902-1061